

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated August 21, 2006. Claims 1-27 are now pending in this case. Claims 1-12 are allowed. Claim 19 is amended.

The applicants wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-12.

Claims 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,154,778 to Koistinen et al. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. Claims 19 is directed to a generic quality of service architecture and it has been amended in a manner similar to that of method claim 1. Claim 19 is allowable for the reasons previously discussed with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Koistinen et al. does not disclose client and server QoS negotiators configured for operation such as recited in claim 19. Accordingly, claim 19 is clearly allowable over Koistinen et al. Claims 20-27 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 19, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

Claims 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Koistinen et al. combined with U.S. Patent Application No. 6,405,251 to Bullard et al. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration. Claim 13 recites *inter alia* “means for storing QoS map order information.” Among other things, a map order will allow a client application to choose a specific server with which it can connect. (See specification, pages 14-15.) Koistinen et al. is directed to a technique for discounting client performance and server performance during the process of a QoS negotiation. However, Koistinen et al. does not teach or suggest any map order information nor means for storing such map order information. Accordingly, claim 13 is clearly allowable over Koistinen et al. Claims 14-17 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 13, and further in view of the recitation in each of those claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicants have made a good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7640.

Respectfully submitted,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

/Michael J. Donohue, Reg. #35859/

Michael J. Donohue

MJD:gatc

1501 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2600
Seattle, Washington 98101-1688
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 628-7699

1879670_1.DOC